



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,758	12/27/2001	Gregg A. McClelland	8350.1647-00	9791

7590 12/13/2007
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

CASCHERA, ANTONIO A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/026,758	Applicant(s) MCCLELLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner Antonio A. Caschera	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-10, 12-20, 22, 23 and 25-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 11, 21 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “SolidWorks Tools – ACP4SWX Overview.” (Berlitz, Stefan. ACP4SWX software overview. Software ver. 1.1.0 released 06/26/2001. (c) 2000, 2001 Stefan Berlitz. (http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://swtools.cad.de/us_prog_acp.htm.) Date accessed via Internet Archive - Wayback Machine 03/13/2007. ACP4SWX Website updated on 08/23/2001). (herein known as “ACP4SWX”).

In reference to claim 1, ACP4SWX discloses a method of colorizing an electronic schematic including at least one feature (see section “What is ACP4SWX”, 2nd paragraph) comprising the steps of:

- identifying a set of features associated with the schematic to be colorized (see section “Installation and function“, “The main features:”, 4th bullet and section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 3rd paragraph);
- establishing a color scheme, wherein the color scheme includes a color, representing a visible wavelength in the electromagnetic spectrum, associated

with at least one of the features in the set (see section “Installation and function“, “The main features:”, 4th bullet, section “Color management” wherein colors are described as stored in catalogue files and section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st-3rd paragraphs); and

- automatically colorizing the at least one feature based on the color scheme to generate a colorized schematic (see section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st-4th paragraphs).

Further it is well known in the art that the software, SolidWorks, which ACP4SWX communicates data with, is equivalent to a “feature-based parametric modeling tool.” (see Applicant’s Arguments of 10/12/06, the incorporated exhibit “Computer-aided design” mentions SolidWorks as such on page 4, 2nd paragraph). Although ACP4SWX does disclose that using the API (application programming interface) from SolidWorks, ACP4SWX will get and set colors for faces, features or components, parts or assemblies (see section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st paragraph) or ACP4SWX obtaining design element colors generated from SolidWorks, ACP4SWX does not explicitly disclose obtaining the schematic, diagram, blueprint or actual illustration of the element from SolidWorks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the design element color obtaining and setting techniques of ACP4SWX including an actual visual reference to the element being colored in order to provide an easier-to-use more intuitive coloring system making the target color object and other surrounding objects easier to visualize while manipulating them.

In reference to claim 2, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses wherein each feature includes one or more

elements (see section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks”, 3rd paragraph. Note, the Office interprets that since ACP4SWX is a tool for the feature-based modeling tool SolidWorks, allowing for colors to be associated with features, ACP4SWX inherently discloses features associated with features and these features comprising multiple elements, i.e. component parts features are made up multiple types of parts), and wherein the step of automatically colorizing the at least one feature includes:

- associating an element with one of the features and automatically colorizing the element based on the color scheme (see section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks”, 3rd paragraph. Note, the Office interprets that since ACP4SWX is a tool for the feature-based modeling tool SolidWorks, allowing for colors to be associated with features, ACP4SWX inherently discloses features associated with features and these features comprising multiple elements, i.e. component parts features are made up multiple types of parts).

In reference to claim 3, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses storing the colorized schematic in an electronic format (see section “Color Management” 1st and 2nd paragraphs).

In reference to claim 5, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 2 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses:

- selecting a feature; and selecting at least one element on the schematic to be associated with the selected feature (see section “Installation and function“, “The main features:”, 4th bullet and section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st-

4th paragraphs. The Office interprets that since a color can be applied to features by ACP4SWX, therefore ACP4SWX inherently discloses selecting a feature to associate the color to. Further, the Office interprets that since ACP4SWX is a tool for the feature-based modeling tool SolidWorks, allowing for colors to be associated with features, ACP4SWX inherently discloses features associated with features and these features comprising multiple elements, i.e. component parts features are made up multiple types of parts).

In reference to claim 6, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 5 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses selecting at least one element in a visual representation of the schematic (see section "Installation and function", "The main features:", 4th bullet and section "Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks" 1st-4th paragraphs. The Office interprets that since a color can be applied to features by ACP4SWX, therefore ACP4SWX inherently discloses selecting a feature to associate the color to).

In reference to claim 7, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 5 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses entering one or more labels associated with the elements in step of selecting at least one element on the schematic (see section "Color management" wherein a label name of a color can be entered. Further, such color can be applied to the features which, as explained above, comprise of multiple elements).

In reference to claim 8, ACP4SWX discloses colorizing an electronic schematic including at least one feature (see section "What is ACP4SWX", 2nd paragraph) comprising the steps of:

- identifying a set of features associated with the schematic to be colorized (see section “Installation and function“, “The main features:”, 4th bullet, section “Color management” wherein colors are described as stored in catalogue files and section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st-3rd paragraphs);;
- establishing a color scheme, wherein the color scheme includes a color, representing a visible wavelength in the electromagnetic spectrum, associated with at least one of the features in the set (see section “Installation and function“, “The main features:”, 4th bullet, section “Color management” wherein colors are described as stored in catalogue files and section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st-3rd paragraphs); and
- automatically colorizing the at least one feature based on the color scheme to generate a colorized schematic (see section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st-4th paragraphs).

Further it is well known in the art that the software, SolidWorks, which ACP4SWX communicates data with, is equivalent to a “feature-based parametric modeling tool.” (see Applicant’s Arguments of 10/12/06, the incorporated exhibit “Computer-aided design” mentions SolidWorks as such on page 4, 2nd paragraph). Although ACP4SWX does disclose that using the API (application programming interface) from SolidWorks, ACP4SWX will get and set colors for faces, features or components, parts or assemblies (see section “Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks” 1st paragraph) or ACP4SWX obtaining design element colors generated from SolidWorks, ACP4SWX does not explicitly disclose obtaining the schematic, diagram, blueprint or actual illustration of the element from SolidWorks. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the design element color obtaining and setting techniques of ACP4SWX including an actual visual reference to the element being colored in order to provide an easier-to-use more intuitive coloring system making the target color object and other surrounding objects easier to visualize while manipulating them. Also, ACP4SWX does not explicitly disclose a computer-readable medium including instructions for performing a method of colorizing a schematic. It is well known in the art of computer graphics processing to store software, such as the software disclosed by ACP4SWX, on some type of computer-readable medium (i.e. RAM, ROM, hard drive, floppy disk, cd-rom etc) (Official Notice). It is would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for ACP4SWX who teaches the methods of a software tool accompanying a CAD program, to store the program on some type of computer-readable medium, because it is well known in the art that programs are stored on computer-readable medium in order for computer processors to execute these programs.

In reference to claim 9, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 8 above. Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under equivalent rationale.

In reference to claim 10, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 9 above. Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under equivalent rationale.

In reference to claim 12, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 8 above. Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under equivalent rationale.

In reference to claim 13, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 12 above. Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under equivalent rationale.

In reference to claim 14, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 12 above. Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 7 and is therefore rejected under equivalent rationale.

In reference to claim 25, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses wherein colors are associated with features, the color being first, second and third colors (see section "Color management" and section "Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks" 1st-3rd paragraphs).

In reference to claim 26, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses wherein establishing a color scheme includes receiving information from a user for establishing the color scheme (see section "Color management" and section "Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks." It can be seen that ACP4SWX includes a GUI which requires information input by a user).

In reference to claim 27, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses wherein establishing a color scheme includes receiving information from a user for associating the color with at least one of the features in the set see section "Color management" and section "Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks", 1st-3rd paragraphs. It can be seen that ACP4SWX includes a GUI which requires information input by a user).

In reference to claim 28, ACP4SWX discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above in addition, ACP4SWX discloses wherein automatically colorizing the at least one feature based on the color scheme to generate a colorized schematic includes automatically colorizing the at least one feature based on the color scheme and based on a user input (see section "Using ACP4SWX with SolidWorks", 3rd paragraph. It can be seen that ACP4SWX includes a GUI which requires information input by a user).

2. Claims 15-20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "SolidWorks Tools – ACP4SWX Overview." (Berlitz, Stefan. ACP4SWX software overview. Software ver. 1.1.0 released 06/26/2001. (c) 2000, 2001 Stefan Berlitz. (http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://swtools.cad.de/us_prog_acp.htm.) Date accessed via Internet Archive - Wayback Machine 03/13/2007. ACP4SWX Website updated on 08/23/2001) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent 5,966,310).

In reference to claims 15 and 22, ACP4SWX discloses a method configured to colorize an electronic schematic including all of the steps disclosed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 8. In addition, ACP4SWX does not explicitly disclose the system components however Maeda does. Maeda discloses a personal design CAD system (see column 1, lines 10-15 and column 2, lines 34-47) comprising:

- a processor (see column 13, lines 29-30, Maeda discloses the invention embodied on a personal computer which inherently comprises a processor; and
- a memory (column 2, lines 63-65 and #26 and 131 of Figure 3)), wherein the memory includes

- a colorization module configured to colorize the schematic to generate a colorized schematic (column 14, lines 14-35 and #122 of Figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system of Maeda et al. with the color tool CAD associated methods of ACP4SWX in order to create a system, conforming to a user, for performing a series of processing including the design of the appearance and production of mechanical/electrical equipment (see column 2, lines 3-12 of Maeda et al.). Further, in reference to claim 22, claim 22 comprises the “identifying”, “establishing” and “colorizing” elements as seen in claim 8 above and therefore these elements are rejected under equivalent rationale as seen above.

In reference to claim 16, ACP4SWX and Maeda et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 15 above. Although both ACP4SWX and Maeda et al. disclose utilizing a CAD tool/software, neither ACP4SWX nor Maeda et al. explicitly disclose the module including a Pro-Engineer software application in memory. It is well known in the art of computer graphics processing to store software, such as the software disclosed by AutoCAD 2000, on some type of memory (i.e. RAM, ROM, hard drive, floppy disk, cd-rom etc) (Official Notice). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for ACP4SWX who teaches the methods of a software tool accompanying a CAD program, to store the program on some type of computer memory, because it is well known in the art that programs are stored on computer-readable mediums in order for computer processors to execute these programs. Further note, the Office interprets that in order to utilize the functions of the ACP4SWX software program, a feature-based parametric modeling tool named SolidWorks must be executed and utilized. The Office sees such a modeling tool, functionally equivalent to the Pro-Engineer software application of

the claim especially since Applicant makes such an equivalence in Applicant's Remarks filed 10/12/06, pages 3-4.

In reference to claim 17, ACP4SWX and Maeda et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 15 above. Maeda et al. also discloses wherein the colorization module is software configured to work with the modeling module during colorization of the schematic (see column 9, lines 34-38, the CAD module is configured to work with graphics module).

In reference to claim 18, ACP4SWX and Maeda et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 15 above. Maeda et al. discloses the CAD invention embodied on a personal computer (see column 13, lines 29-30) which the Office interprets as inherently comprising an "output module" since Maeda et al. also discloses providing the output to a display (see column 9, lines 39-40 and #145 of Figure 4).

In reference to claim 19, ACP4SWX and Maeda et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 15 above. Maeda et al. also discloses including an input module for accepting inputs from one or more of a keyboard, point-and-click device or an storage medium reader (see column 8, lines 58-62 and #11 of Figure 3).

In reference to claim 20, ACP4SWX and Maeda et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 15 above. Claim 20 is similar in scope to 8 above and is therefore rejected under equivalent rationale.

In reference to claim 23, ACP4SWX and Maeda et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 22 above. Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under equivalent rationale.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-14 of Applicant's Remarks, filed 10/05/07, with respect to 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 1-14 and 25-28 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 101 rejection of claims 1-14 and 25-28 has been withdrawn since amendments to the claims now conform with accepted by the Office language and further since a clarification of interim guidelines for examination of patent applications for subject matter eligibility has recently been realized by the Office.

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 15-16 of Applicant's Remarks, filed 10/05/07, with respect to 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 8-14 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 8-14 has been withdrawn since amendments to the claims remedy the previously established issues.

5. Applicant's arguments, see page 18, last paragraph of Applicant's Remarks, filed 10/05/07, with respect to the prior art rejection of claims 4, 11, 21 and 24 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The prior art rejection of claims 4, 11, 21 and 24 has been withdrawn.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10/05/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reference to claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14 and 25-28, Applicant traverses the Office's statement of obvious in view of the "obtaining a schematic..." limitation of the independent claims (see page 16 of Applicant's Remarks) and states that such an interpretation results from impermissible use of hindsight (see pages 17-18, last-first paragraphs of Applicant's Remarks).. Applicant further states even if it would have been obvious to implement the design element

color obtaining and setting techniques of ACP4SWX including an actual visual reference to the element being colored, it would not have been obvious to perform the "obtaining a schematic..." limitation as recited in the independent claims since the ACP4SWX reference actually teaches away from the claimed invention when the prior art states that colors for component faces or features can be set without leaving the assembly (see pages 16-17 of Applicant's Remarks). Lastly, Applicant argues that the ACP4SWX reference does not even contemplate the coloring of a "schematic" as claimed (see page 17 of Applicant's Remarks).

In response the Office attempts to further explain its basis of the obvious statement and interpretation of the limitation in question. As stated above, ACP4SWX does not explicitly disclose obtaining the schematic, diagram, blueprint or actual illustration of the element from SolidWorks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the design element color obtaining and setting techniques of ACP4SWX including an actual visual reference to the element being colored in order to provide an easier-to-use more intuitive coloring system making the target color object and other surrounding objects easier to visualize while manipulating them. The above limitation of "obtaining a schematic generated from a feature-based parametric modeling tool" (see line 3 of claim 1 for example) is seen as obvious since it has been established that the software, SolidWorks, which ACP4SWX communicates data with, such data being features, components and color data, is equivalent to a "feature-based parametric modeling tool." (see Applicant's Arguments of 10/12/06, the incorporated exhibit "Computer-aided design" mentions SolidWorks as such on page 4, 2nd paragraph). Therefore, the Office believes that the critical feature/component data is already communicated to the ACP4SWX software for performing the

coloring techniques as described in the claims. The limitation of specifically receiving a “schematic” or simply a visual representation of such already obtain by ACP4SWX data, is seen as obvious because it is interpreted as simply just this, a visual representation of already received data. Such a visual representation of data would have been obvious and advantageously recreated in ACP4SWX in order to provide the user with a more intuitive feature/component editing experience by visually representing such features/components with the newly colorized parameters applied thereupon. Also, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Therefore, the Office maintains ACP4SWX in view of the above.

Further, in response to Applicant's "teaching away" argument, the Office points out that such a feature of setting colors for component faces or features without leaving the assembly is merely a “feature” and is explicitly explained as one embodiment or "situation" by ACP4SWX (see page 9/11, paragraph starting "There is one situation where..."). In other words, ACP4SWX is describing another manner in operating the software with SolidWorks. However it is clear that ACP4SWX clearly describes in the main functioning of the software that color editing is performed within ACP4SWX (see page 8/11, “ACP4SWX is designed to work with SolidWorks but will not depend on it...”). Therefore, the Office disagrees in the statement that ACP4SWX

teaches away from the claimed invention and maintains its current rejection based upon the above.

Lastly, although ACP4SWX does not explicitly discuss the coloring of a schematic per say, taking the definition of the schematic from Applicant's specification, ACP4SWX does teach all of the other limitations of claim 1 and the Office has established above, the obviousness of visually displaying features/components and associated color data or "obtaining a schematic...". Therefore, the Office believes ACP4SWX to disclose the invention as claimed and maintains its rejection based upon the above.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 4, 11, 21 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Application/Control Number:
10/026,758
Art Unit: 2628

Page 16

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Antonio Caschera whose telephone number is (571) 272-7781. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays between 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung, can be reached at (571) 272-7794.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

571-273-8300 (Central Fax)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

aac



12/10/07

Antonio Caschera
Patent Examiner



KEE M. TUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER